DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 607 SP 036 108

AUTHOR da Costa, Jose L.
TITLE Teacher Collaboration: The Roles of Trust and Respect.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beliefs; Cooperation; *Cooperative Planning; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Foreign Countries; Participative Decision Making; *Partnerships in Education; *Peer Relationship; Rapport; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; *Trust (Psychology)
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This study explored the question of how teacher collaboration programs impact the sense of trust and respect between cooperating professionals. Ten elementary school teachers constituting five collaborating dyads volunteered to participate in a three-phase clinical supervision cycle, including a pre-observation goal-setting conference, classroom observation data collection, and a post-observation data sharing and analysis conference. Participants completed this cycle at least four times throughout the school year, and evaluated the experience through semi-structured interviews. Results indicated that trust and respect between collaborators was a prerequisite to effective collaboration, and that without trust and respect collaboration was futile. Trust between teachers and administrators seemed to evolve more quickly when not initiated by the administrator, and the period of time required to develop trust among teachers appeared to be longer in cases where collaboration was mandated by school or district policy. Expertise in specific subject areas was not found to be prerequisite to establishment of trust. Common philosophical beliefs that were shared by those who established the most energetic and effective collaborative relationships included: a shared understanding that collaboration must be non-threatening evaluatively; mutual input in the process and ability to move in new directions as necessary; and seeing students as the focus of the collaboration and of education itself. (Contains 21 references and 2 interview schedules.) (PB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 384 607

TEACHER COLLABORATION: THE ROLES OF TRUST AND RESPECT

by

José L. da Costa

Department of Educational Policy Studies
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Canada, T6G 2G5

A Paper Prepared for Presentation at the
1995 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting
San Francisco, California

April 18-22, 1995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. da Costa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

SP036108

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher Collaboration: The Roles of Trust and Respect[1]

The main advantage of teachers interacting collaboratively is identified by Little (1987) as "breaking the isolation of the classroom" (p. 494)--a problem identified by Lortie (1975), Ashton and Webb (1986), and more recently by Gresso and Robertson (1992) as significant and endemic to the teaching profession. The reduction of teacher isolation is associated with other benefits for experienced teachers. Cohen (1981, cited in Little, 1987) indicated that teacher collaboration is significantly correlated to teachers' capacities to assimilate new curriculum. Similarly, Lesnik (1987) found that "curricular innovation" was more likely when teachers worked together than when they worked in isolation. Sgan and Milford (1986) asserted that while the traditional model of "top-down" supervision has not worked, "school based teacher support teams offer a way of effectively providing direct instructional supervisory support to teachers" (p. 72).

The reported benefits of teachers working in pairs or small groups with colleagues do not come as a surprise. The literature is replete with examples of instructional support teams (e.g., Sgan & Clark, 1986), clinical supervision dyads (e.g., Grimmett & Crehan, 1990), site based decision making and management (Brown, 1994), shared decision making (e.g., Alvarez, 1992) and their advantages not only to the participants but also to their organizations. Repeatedly, the literature (e.g., Brown, 1994; Newmann, 1994) asserted that the success of teacher collaboration teams could not be possible without trust and respect existing within the team.

Review of the Literature

Educational researchers have conducted numerous studies on the effects of teacher collaboration models, based on Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer's (1980) "clinical supervision," on teacher development. Grimmett and Erickson (1988) considered the act of teacher collaboration to be

---

[1]The feedback provided by Geoff Riordan, my graduate assistant, and the participants in this study is gratefully acknowledged--without their help this study would not have been possible. Financial support from the University of Alberta and the Faculty of Education at the U. of A. is also gratefully recognised.

one of reflection leading to improvement. Oberg (1989) regarded it as a creative act which facilitates reflection. Their belief is that when teachers actively participate in regular, systematic consultation, they will reflect more on the methods and content of their daily instruction, which in turn leads to changes in the classroom. Presumably, the changes made to teachers' classroom instruction have a positive effect on student learning (Acheson & Gall, 1992).

A major assumption made by those engaging in teacher collaboration for the purpose of teacher development is that a climate of trust exists (da Costa, 1993). In other words, the teacher and teaching-partner must have a high degree of trust and respect for each other professionally if the teacher collaboration process is to be successful in promoting teacher development. Lovell and Wiles (1983) go so far as to state that ". . . mutual trust . . . is essential . . . [as is] . . . mutual respect for [each other's] professional competence. In this context, mutual trust can be seen as a quality that two or more people have for one-another when they feel that it is possible to "safely" confide in the other person, take chances, and succeed or fail without diminishing their sense of self-worth. Mutual respect is the quality observed in individuals who esteem each other's opinions or statements. Lovell and Wiles (1983) asserted that "without these two conditions, it is impossible to have effective clinical supervision" (p. 182). This argument can be extended to teachers using the "clinical supervision" model--the cycle consisting basically of a pre-observation goal setting conference, the collection of observational data, and the discussion of and reflection on those data collected in a post-observation conference--as a non-hierarchical teacher professional development tool.

To address the problem of lack of trust between a teacher and his or her teaching-partner the literature (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 1986; Russell & Spafford, 1986) has call for the involvement of peers, rather than administrators, in the collaboration process. However, this suggestion does little more than to remove some of the apprehension that teachers may experience when they are involved in the formative supervision process with someone that has actual or perceived summative supervision responsibilities for evaluation of individuals' teaching performance. Engaging peers, as suggested by the literature, does not automatically ensure that a trusting and respecting climate is generated, peers

can also be distrustful and disrespectful of each other. Lyman, Morehead, and Foyle (1988) identified three qualities necessary for the establishment of trust: (a) the teacher must believe that the information gathered by the colleague will not somehow be used evaluatively; (b) sufficient time for building trust must be provided so that the anxiety about the process can be reduced and, ultimately, eliminated; and, (c) in addition to providing time to build trust, the individuals must have the patience for building a trusting relationship.

Blumberg and Jonas (1987) addressed the importance of mutual respect for each others' competence when they suggested that the professional respect required for the collaborative relationship to be effective may be compromised when the teaching-partner lacks specific expertise in the subject area of the specialist teacher. Blumberg and Jonas (1987) noted that, if the supervisory experience is to be beneficial, teaching-partner credibility is a necessary aspect of the relationship in order for the teaching-partner to gain psychological, if not physical, access to the teacher. Recommendations regarding what teaching-partners can do to demonstrate competence to teachers and thus earn and maintain their professional respect are lacking in the literature.

From this literature emerges the central question being investigated in the present study: "After engaging in a program of teacher collaboration, what is the relationship between teacher trust and respect for his or her teaching-partner and the perceived outcomes which resulted from the collaboration activities?" Emerging from this general question are five sub-questions of interest:

1. How does the selection, or appointment, of teaching-partners impact the development of trust that exists between the teachers and teaching-partners?
2. How do teachers and teaching-partners strive to establish and maintain trust for each other in their professional relationship?
3. How do teachers and teaching-partners strive to establish and maintain respect for each other in their professional relationship?
4. How does the degree of trust established impact the teachers' choice of "problems" on which to focus during the collaboration process? And,

5. How does the degree of respect established impact the teachers' choice of "problems" on which to focus during the collaboration process?

This paper offers preliminary and tentative answers, gleaned from data collected in an ongoing study of teacher collaboration, to the questions listed above.

Method

This investigation made extensive use of semi-structured interviews with teachers and their teaching-partners who engage in a systematic program of teacher collaboration. The analyses of the interviews were conducted through the use of narrative accounts to support emerging themes.

Sample

The sample consisted of ten teachers constituting five reciprocal dyads[2] (see Table 1). Initially, teachers who had participated in a Supervision of Instruction course, focusing on the theory and implementation of teacher collaborative consultation as a professional development tool, taught by the researcher during the last year were asked to participate in this investigation. After a period of several weeks, three individuals, and their teaching-partners--representing two public elementary schools and one private special needs elementary school--indicated their desire to participate in the study. Within one week of these individuals volunteering for the study, the person from the private school indicated that four more teachers (two dyads) from her school were also interested in participating in the study.

At the private school represented in this study, the mandated policy is that teachers will work in small groups to provide an opportunity for coordination of program planning and delivery. Currently, this policy does not extend to using teacher collaboration for the purpose of teacher professional development. The public schools represented in this study have no such policy: The teachers who choose to work in groups do so of their own will.

Overall, the volunteers represented a broad cross-section of classroom teaching experience. Teaching experience for the individuals working in the private school setting ranged from less than 1

---

[2] In a reciprocal dyad the teacher and teaching-partner exchange roles periodically as desired by the teacher and his or her partner.

Table 1. Background Information Regarding the Participants.

Name	School	Position in school	How team was formed	Does teacher evaluation	Engaged in Super-vision course	Teaching exp.	Time at present school	Time known each other	Time collaborat-ing with each other
Bob	Peapod Elem.	Music/ Computer teacher	Chose to work together	No	Yes	14 yrs	2 yrs	2 yrs	1 yr
Bev		Classroom teacher		No	No	16 yrs	8 yrs		
Cathy	Farwest Elem.	VP/ classroom teacher	Chose to work together	Yes	Yes	15 yrs	5 yrs	15 yrs	1 yr
Cindy		Classroom teacher		No	No	15 yrs	10 yrs		
Jane	Valleyview Elem.	Speech Pathologist	School policy-- Assigned through consultation process	No	No	6 yrs	5 yrs	<1 yr	<1 yr
Jill		Classroom teacher		No	No	13 yrs	1 yrs		
Mary	Valleyview Elem.	Principal/ classroom teacher	School policy-- Assigned through consultation process	Yes	Yes	20 yrs	6 yrs	4 yrs	1 yr
Marg		Classroom teacher		No	No	15 yrs	4 yrs		
Liz	Valleyview Elem.	Junior classroom teacher	School policy-- Assigned through consultation process	No	No	<1yr	<1 yr	<1 yr	<1 yr
Linda		Classroom teacher		No	No	5 yrs	2 yrs		

Note. All members of each dyad have been given names beginning with the same letter so that teams can be easily identified.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

year to 20 years. For those teachers in the public school setting, teaching experience ranged from 14 to 16 years.

The Process

The process in which teachers and their teaching-partners were involved drew on the principles of Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer's (1980) clinical supervision. Dyads participated in cycles consisting of three phases: (a) pre-observation goal setting conference, (b) classroom observation data collection, and (c) post-observation data sharing and analysis conference (which was audio-taped and provided to the researcher). During each cycle one individual and/or his or her classroom becomes the focus of the cycle while the other person collects data and engages in professional dialogue with the former. Because the dyads are reciprocal in nature, the individuals alternate the role they fulfil from one cycle to the next.

Participants in this study have been instructed to engage in a minimum of four cycles during the 1994/95 school year. At this time (February 15, 1995) four dyads have completed at least one cycle and two dyads have engaged in two complete cycles.

Interviews

Semi-structured interviews with each individual were conducted before and after each collaboration cycle (See appendix for the basic interview questions). All interviews subsequent to the first interview were conducted after the interviewer had had an opportunity to review the audio-tape of the post-observation conference that had just taken place. During the interview, questions were asked in reference to the content and process of the collaboration cycle as experienced by the individual--both the teacher and the teaching-partner. These interviews typically lasted 25 minutes with some as brief as 15 minutes and others exceeding 60 minutes. All participants were provided with copies of verbatim transcripts of their conferences and interviews so that their veracity could be checked.

The interviewers consisted of the researcher and a graduate research assistant. In keeping with the naturalistic data analysis approach being used, both interviewers kept notes of their thoughts and interpretations as data were gathered. These thoughts and interpretations were shared and discussed

by the interviewers in order to obtain intersubjective agreement. As a result of these discussions, questions were altered and added to address emerging concerns.

Data Analysis

The interviews and post-observation conferences were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim. The transcripts of the protocols were conducted, by two independent analyzers, through the use of narrative accounts to support emerging themes. Because of the naturalistic qualities of this study data analysis is an ongoing and tentative process.

This paper represents a preliminary analysis of the data gathered, consequently, participants will be invited to respond to and challenge the interpretations and assertions made. The responses will then form further data for analysis and inclusion in the final report. This will be done to ascertain the veracity of the interpretations.

Findings and Discussion

The following section will focus on a description and discussion of the findings garnered from this preliminary analysis of the data collected in an ongoing study of the roles of trust and respect in the processes of teacher collaboration. This section is divided into five subsections. The first four subsections address the participants' perceptions of: (a) beliefs held regarding the purposes of collaboration, (b) the positive and negative aspects of collaboration, (c) their reactions and their partners' reactions to the process of collaboration, and (d) the development of and maintenance of trust and respect in the collaborative relationships. The fifth subsection will address tentative responses to the five sub-questions and the general question posed at the beginning of this paper.

Participants Beliefs Regarding the Purposes of Collaboration

Three themes emerged from the interviews with respect to beliefs held by the participants as they engaged in the process of collaborating. Interestingly, those individuals who found the experience of collaborating with a partner particularly rewarding, and who were willing to overcome obstacles of time and scheduling difficulties, held these beliefs regarding collaboration in high esteem. First, the process is not evaluative. Second, both members of the dyad have equal and mutual input into the

collaborative process. And third, although collaboration is a means of sharing problems and successes with a pupil focus, it is not necessarily a means of increasing teaching efficiency.

Non-evaluative interaction. Members of the dyads from the Peapod and Farwest Elementary schools and one of the Valleyview Elementary dyads (Liz and Linda) all articulated the belief that the purpose of the process they were engaging in was not to evaluate or to destructively critique each other. Thinking in this vein, Bev stated:

> ...in our case we just share...I don't see us critiquing each other in a real heavy handed kind of way. I think it's really...an almost soft kind of agreeable way all the time.... I don't see it as anything threatening at all. (i20:6:41-47)

Cindy expressed the same sentiment in her response to the question "what is it about the conferencing that you especially liked?" when she said "...you get to rehash what you've done and you get to feel good about the things that you did...well, there's always something that you can improve and you discuss that....It's helpful. Not criticism, but suggestions..." (i26:5:29-30,35).

Mutuality and flexibility. Several participants articulated the notion of mutual input and flexibility. Although both members of the dyad do not need to contribute equally at all times, both members should expect to contribute as much information and direction to the collaboration process as possible. Helping to provide direction to the process includes being flexible enough to be able to move in directions which had previously not been considered. Bev introduced this notion when she said:

> Yeah, I would say "so what do you think about this?" "Yeah, that sound great, why don't we do it this way?" "And what can we get the kids to do...?" And "yeah, ..." just sort of lead into the other. I like that about Bob, the fact that he's open enough to change things. (i20:4:27-29)

Linda also addressed this notion of sharing the input and having the capacity to change if needed when she talked about her discussions with Liz:

> It's good to talk to Liz about way to deal with the kids and how to handle them....we've discussed strategies and some ideas of how to do that and whether or not we felt what we did was right or wrong. So we've kind of come to an understanding between the two of us how we're going to deal with Cynthia [a student]. (i29:2:16-21)

Pupil focus. Collaboration was not seen by the members of the two dyads from Peapod Elementary and Farwest Elementary as a means of reducing the teaching load. For these teachers, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

purpose of collaborating was to make education better for the pupils and not necessarily to reduce their workloads. As far as changes made to the method of instruction, Bob stated "You want to make sure you're not just changing for change sake, you want to make sure it benefits the students" (i27:9:8-9). This perspective was summed up by Bev and Bob in their conference when they stated:

> Bev: I thought the meeting was very positive with the kids. And I also appreciated the fact that we could trade off in terms of presenting the dialogue. One teacher didn't have to do all the talking.
> Bob: Yes, it was very much a thing where we kind of spelled each other off, and I kind of like that, in comparison to the team thing where...one teacher disappears and one will work through 60 to give yourself an extra break each...
> Bev: Side by side, I really like that. (c11:1:24-32)

A very different perspective was provided by Jill. In her first interview she indicated that "...it [collaboration] should be an enjoyable process and be more efficient at getting things done..." (i12:3:20-21). The perception here was that collaborating would reduce the teaching load. Jill's partner, Jane, explained how she perceived the collaboration process to function in her dyad:

> ...we have the luxury of breaking up the kids into needs groups like ability groups and each of us take a group that we know that the goals are going to be addressed meeting both curriculum and communication goals....you see the beauty of this is that if I...have to do all 12 kids, one on one by myself in my limited time, I probably can't reach it [my goal]...but if other people who have more influence on the kids because they spend more of the day with them, are the team assistant and the teacher....So...my sort of agenda is to improve the teacher and team assistant's skills in handling communication disordered people. (i13:2-3:39-4)

Although sharing the workload here is a concern, one of the attractions of collaboration for Jane was the expectation that her goals could be met when she was unable to provide instruction. Although Jane's focus was pupil centred, and her interactions with Jill would not be characterized as evaluative, it appeared that she had a unilateral interest for wanting to collaborate with Jill. Not surprisingly, six months after the beginning of the school year, Jill and Jane had not been able to complete their first collaboration cycle.

Selecting the "right" partner. A number of participants shared insights with me regarding how they knew that they were working with the "right person" in this collaboration process. In this vein Bob started off by saying "You have to ask the right person. Some teachers I still would not ask...I would ask them the time of day and they'd tell me to go get a watch" (i27:13:7-10). As discussed above, for

those teachers working at the Peapod Elementary and Farwest Elementary schools a common theme seemed to emerge regarding the need to hold similar, if not the same, philosophical beliefs regarding how pupils should be educated and why collaborating with a colleague is important.

With respect to the importance of collaborating with another teacher having similar philosophical beliefs regarding teaching, Cathy stated: "...I like conferencing with somebody that you're on the same wave length with" (25:5:1-2). Along the same lines, Bev indicated that: "We were so in sync, I guess it just sort of worked" (i20:7:40-41). Repeatedly, the message that the partners think alike was heard from the teachers of Peapod Elementary and Farwest Elementary schools.

Perceptions of the Positive and Negative Aspects of Collaborating

Teacher reactions to questions about their perceptions of the disadvantages and advantages of collaborating with their partners consistently pointed to the existence of more advantages than disadvantages. However, the nature of the main disadvantage was such that it can easily outweigh the combined advantages.

Positive aspects of collaboration. The participants in this study were able to identify and articulate at least five positive aspects of collaborating with a colleague. Teachers indicated that working with a partner in a reciprocal dyad: (a) provided recognition that what the teacher knows is valuable and important (e.g., interviews i29:4:24-25, i21:2:33-34); (b) provided support, feedback, and reduces the isolation typically experienced by teachers (e.g., interviews i20:2:25-41, i25:3:19-25); (c) allowed them to learn about the pupils in the school more quickly (e.g., interviews i27:4:35-38, i25:3-2-4); and, (d) engendered a commitment to the partner to follow through with what was agreed (e.g., interviews i28:5:28-29, i20:4:25-29). For teachers new to the school, an advantage that the relationship allowed them to learn the norms and expectations of the school quickly without the negative experiences many teachers have in a new school.

These positive aspects of teacher collaboration captured by Bev as she explained her perceptions of how her and Bob's pupils had worked in small collaborative teams:

> They loved doing it, it was just brilliant. It was like I guess, as a colleague, if you get to work with a colleague for us, it feels the same way for them. They feel like they're part

of something bigger than who they are. (i20:4:2-4)

This observation of the synergy the students experienced was paralleled in the teachers' experiences of their collaboration. Collaboration for the teacher created a positive contagious synergy that was shared with their students, and they, in turn, shared with their teachers. It was a rewarding, affirming and energizing experience for all involved.

Negative aspects of collaboration. The single greatest problem associated with the collaboration process was the lack of time. This sentiment was echoed by every respondent. Comments ranged from referring to the process as an additional demand on time to simply indicating that only a limited time could be spent conferencing. Mary communicated her frustration with the lack of time in her comment: "It's the time....Finding the time for it [collaborating] and then it becomes another demand that we have to fulfil" (i28:5:42,46). Linda suggested that not very much time could be devoted to the collaboration activity because of other demands: "...we were really rushed the day we did the post-conference" (i29:4:12).

Scheduling problems were related to the issue of time constraints. Often one member of a dyad was unavailable to collect data or conference with the other member at a desirable time. Cathy echoed this sentiment in her comment regarding what she would like to do differently in future collaboration cycles: "...the other group...is the one that I really wanted Cindy to observe, but her timetable and my timetable didn't jive for us to do that" (i25:5:23-26).

However, even though the lack of time was seen as problematic, it did not prove to be an obstacle for four of the five dyads. Time was found for conferencing and observing one another. Bob and Bev's solution for finding time to observe one another was to combine their classes and co-teach the combined class--they were then able to discuss and give meaning to what had transpired in their combined group during a post-conference.

Reactions to the Process of Conferencing

Because conferencing is such an important and integral part of the collaboration cycle, teachers were specifically asked about their feelings during the conferences with their teaching-partners. All

respondents indicated that as the conferences progressed, particularly the post-observation conference, they became increasingly relaxed with the process and generally saw value in what they were doing.

From discomfort to exhilaration. All respondents reported being uncomfortable with the conferencing process, particularly the post-observation conference, during the initial stage of the interaction. This was due primarily to the presence of the tape recorder. However, Liz and Marg did provide slightly different reasons for feeling uncomfortable. Liz indicated that her initial discomfort was due to lack of experience: "I mean it was awkward because we weren't sure what we were doing, but I think that was just a first run through, and now we have an idea of what we're doing" (i21:3:26-28). Marg, whose partner is responsible for evaluation, attributed her discomfort to "...the evaluation thing....I was pretty down on myself, thinking that I hadn't done what I was supposed to have done" (i24:2-3:50-3).

As the conferences progressed, all respondents reported feeling comfortable and pleased with the quality of their interactions. Comments about the process ranged from it having been one of "negotiation...and compromise and companionship, like a real camaraderie" (i20:7:30) to having experienced a sense of accomplishment: "We're doing not too badly! We're actually talking and we're saying things that make sense..." (i26:4:28). That collaborating breaks the isolation of the classroom--a problem discussed by Lortie (1975), Ashton and Webb (1986), Little (1987), and Gresso and Robertson (1992)--was evident throughout the interviews. Bev identified the reduced isolation as one of the main advantages of collaborating. When asked about advantages of collaborating, she stated: "I think just having somebody to share with, because you know sometimes teaching is such a solo profession, and you think...'did I do that the best way I could?'" (i20:6:37-38).

Liz's response to the probing regarding how she was feeling by the middle of the post-observation conference was "comfortable and at ease and we talked about things that we saw..." (i27:9:47-49). Even Marg stopped feeling like what she was involved in had the sting of evaluation by the middle of the post-observation conference: "Mary was really good....I felt really good, because seeing on paper, I realized that no, I had asked kids the appropriate questioning. I felt better, because

just the documentation in front of me, and the way she talked to me was helpful" (i24:3:1-10). And by the end of the conference, Marg had this comment regarding how she was feeling: "I guess more positive, more positive about it and looking forward to doing some more follow up to this" (i24:14-15). The fact that Marg stopped doubting herself did not occur spontaneously. Mary was acutely aware of her partner's self-doubt, and knew that she had to address it by providing the data that showed, emphatically, that Marg was an excellent teacher and that any improvements would only serve to make her an even better teacher.

What is "fair game" for discussion? While all of the dyads reported having adhered, during the post-observation conference discussions, to the foci established during the pre-observation goal setting conferences, two distinct differences emerge between the teachers from Valleyview Elementary school and the teachers from Peabody Elementary and Farwest Elementary schools. The two dyads from Valleyview Elementary school, who had completed their first cycle of observation and conferencing reported that the focus of the post-observation conferences had been strictly on what had been agreed to during the pre-observation conferences. No topics outside those discussed during the pre-observation conferences were addressed during the post-observation conferences.

In stark contrast, the dyads from Farwest Elementary and Peapod Elementary schools both reported that although the primary focus of the post-observation conferences had been discussed during the pre-observation conferences, the discussion was not limited to only the previously agreed to topics. Other topics were introduced, by the teacher--not by the teaching-partner, which were related to the observational data collected. Cathy stated: "She brought up some comments, I didn't, about her own lesson of what things she would have done differently...that wasn't what I was looking at and wasn't what she'd asked me to give her feedback on" (i25:2:10-12). Furthermore, the four members of these dyads reported that they were able to discuss topics outside of the focus of the conferences. The general consensus of these four individuals was that it was easier, having collaborated for a number of months, to share ideas related to any topic. This might be because these people have been able to establish trusting relationships more quickly that those teachers at Valleyview Elementary where

teachers are assigned to groups, albeit with their input, for collaborative purposes.

Trust and Respect

Feelings of having a trusting and respecting relationship with the teaching-partner were shared by all of the teachers at Peapod Elementary and Farwest Elementary schools and the dyad composed of Liz and Linda from Valleyview Elementary school. These six people made reference to their high level of comfort in taking risks with their partners and in being able to confide in their partners. Two of these teachers also made reference to their confidence in their own teaching abilities.

Feeling safe and being able to trust. The element of feeling safe was abundantly evident in the comments made by Bob as well as Cathy. Regarding his ability to confide in Bev, Bob stated: "...I don't worry that Bev's going to say 'well, you did this, you didn't mention this to the students and look how you buggered up.' No one's going to use that against me. I don't expect her to" (i27:11:1-3). Cathy echoed this sentiment:

> Even if something happened that I thought was a total disaster...Cindy would say "well, maybe you could do this, or try this" and I would say "yeah, I need to do it, good idea." Whereas if it was someone else...you'd feel kind of ooohhhh, having someone say that to you...I should have thought of that on my own. (i25:4:26-31)

Similarly, Cathy's partner, Cindy shared this sense that taking risks and having her partner witness them was not threatening to her. The consensus is that there is no danger of the information ever being used in ways that could harm the teachers' professional reputation. It seems that as trust develops between teachers and their teaching-partners, the teaching-partner is able to make comments and suggestions that would destroy a less trusting relationship by "stepping over the line" of what the teacher is willing to tolerate.

Inextricably linked to the importance of maintaining one's reputation is the teacher's own sense of his or her own abilities as a teacher. Cindy linked the perception of risk taking to her confidence in her own teaching abilities, she said: "I trust Cathy and feel confident enough in my teaching ability that whatever happens I'll go through it" (i26:4:10-11). This sense of having confidence in one's own teaching abilities is one that was also shared by Bob. He explained that:

If you've tried something in the best interest of the students, I've learned as a teacher

> you can defend it too...perhaps it didn't work out the way I wanted, here is the plan, as long as you have a plan and it's fitting with the curriculum...you can justify and if it falls on its face, it's not for lack of effort. (i27:13:45-51)

The importance of instilling this sense of confidence in her partner was so strong for Mary that she felt it was important to emphasize and remind Marg of her abilities. Mary saw Marg as a very good and capable teacher whose self confidence could be bolstered. This perception seems reasonable given Marg's feelings of uncertainty during the post-observation conference with Mary. When questioned about this, Mary stated:

> I think as we went on through it, I felt really good. Because Marg was picking up on the observation, she was feeding into them [the observations made] as well and it seemed like we were actually getting to grips with what the data was showing us....At the end, I know that both of us felt really "up" when we'd finished because we'd gone through this process and we found some really positive things and I always feel good about reinforcing the positives with a good teacher. (i28:5:14-18)

These findings support what Lyman, Morehead, and Foyle (1988) said about precursors to establishing trust. It appears that trust for another individual develops much more slowly as the teachers' confidence in their own abilities diminish. Furthermore, the recommendation, made by Darling-Hammond (1986) and Russell and Spafford (1986), calling for the involvement of peers in the collaboration process rather than administrators, may be very effective as a means of accelerating the development of trust when teachers may doubt their teaching abilities. This assumes that Lyman, Morehead, and Foyle's (1988) three pre-conditions for trust are adequately addressed. By working with a peer who are not administrators, teachers having low teaching efficacy may feel less threatened by knowing that the partners with whom they are working will not use the information gathered for evaluation purposes since their partners are not in a position to make an evaluative report. Further to this is the notion that there is a security in the powerful norms of teaching that peers will "protect one of their own."

The issue of trust is still a very sensitive and important one, especially if a teacher with a low sense of teaching efficacy believes that the information gathered by the peer may somehow end up in the hands of someone responsible for the evaluation process. Those teachers who do not trust their partners are not likely to improve their practice by "reflecting" on the collaboration process as suggested by Grimmett and Erickson (1988).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The role of perception in the development of respect. Respect for the opinion of the teaching-partner was a characteristic that was evident in the discussions with Bev and with Cindy. Respect appears to be centred on valuing the teaching-partner's opinions regarding various issues. It appears to be a quality that can be built or eroded on the basis of what the teaching-partner says about the issues being scrutinized. Respect seems to be a perception held by the teacher that the teaching-partner can analyze a situation by drawing on pertinent knowledge about the topic and then provide, what seems to the teacher as, a reasonable argument for continuing or altering a particular strategy. Linda expressed the sense that there exists mutual respect between her and Liz, she stated:

> It's good to talk to Liz about ways to deal with the kids and how to handle them....we've discussed strategies and some ideas of how to do that and whether or not we felt what we did was right or wrong. So we've kind of come to an understanding between the two of us how we're going to deal with Roxanne [a student]. (i29:2:16-21)

As a means of verifying her respect for Bob's opinion about what transpired during a lesson that was team-taught, Bev said that before the first post-observation conference she was "...wondering what Bob would say...knowing that I felt comfortable with what we had done...but wanting to hear what he had to say" (i20:7:17-19). Interestingly, lack of subject matter expertise, which contradicts what Lovell and Wiles (1983) suggest, has not been an impediment for Bob and Bev in their establishment and development of respect for one another. In fact, this has been seen as a strength in that they are able to complement each other in terms of having different strengths and weaknesses. It appears that Lovell and Wiles' (1983) conclusion need qualification. When the focus of the observation is subject matter related then their comments regarding the lack of subject matter expertise are warranted. However, when the focus is pedagogical in nature then their comments do not apply.

Some Tentative Responses to the Research Questions

A general research question and five sub-questions guide this work in progress. Recognizing that this study is qualitative in nature and, as a result, is evolving as it progresses to its completion the responses provided below regarding the research questions are offered tentatively. The discussion will address the sub-questions first and then, on the basis of the responses to these, offer tentative responses to the general question.

Research sub-question #1: How does the selection, or appointment, of teaching-partners impact the development of trust that exists between the teachers and teaching-partners? The selection, or appointment, of teaching-partners did appear to impact the development of trust between teachers and teaching-partners. For the teachers working in the school which mandated the formation of teacher collaboration teams, trust developed more slowly than for those teachers working in schools in which the individuals elected to collaborate. It stands to reason that people who are willing to commit a large portion of their time and energy to pursuing something they believe to be of benefit will progress more rapidly than those individuals who are asked, or told, to try something new--in this case collaborating with a peer.

For those teachers who chose to work together, many impediments--lack of time, scheduling conflicts--became little more than a challenge which they took on, often, enthusiastically. For those teachers whose school had a collaboration policy, the impediments described above often became, or were cited as being, insurmountable obstacles. At the time this paper was written--six months into the school year--the dyad consisting of Jane and Jill indicated to me that they had not been able to find the time to conduct a collaboration cycle for the purpose of professional development.

Research sub-question #2: How do teachers and teaching-partners strive to establish and maintain trust for each other in their professional relationship? It appears that teachers who have high levels of confidence in their teaching abilities are more likely to allow other individuals, teachers or administrators, into trusting professional relationships more readily than teachers with low teaching efficacy. Furthermore, the teachers who addressed what they sensed as being important for maintaining or even increasing trust for their teaching-partners indicated that being able to confide in their partners without the fear of being evaluated, or having their confidence betrayed were very important factors.

Research sub-question #3: How do teachers and teaching-partners strive to establish and maintain respect for each other in their professional relationship? How teachers strive to maintain respect is only partially addressed by the data collected to date and their subsequent analysis. These data have only partially revealed how teachers strive to maintain respect. It seems that respect is

something that one teacher has for another teacher in that the opinions of the second teacher are seen as valuable. Presumably, a teacher who is repeatedly provided with feedback from a teaching-partner which is not in keeping with the teacher's perception of situations being discussed or analyzed will begin to doubt the credibility of the teaching-partner. Ultimately, the teacher's respect for such an individual will become diminished. It is doubtful that any professional development would occur on the part of the teacher that could be attributed to the words or actions of an unrespected teaching-partner.

Research sub-question #4: How does the degree of trust established impact the teachers' choice of "problems" on which to focus during the collaboration process? The degree of trust established seems to greatly impact the choice of "problems" or issues that become the focus of the collaboration process. The evidence gathered suggests that teachers who have a great deal of trust for their partners are able to address any topic during their pre-observation and post-observation conference deliberations. Furthermore, the norms related to discussing topics related to pedagogy change so that the discussions are not confined to the pre- and post observation conferences, they occur any time the teacher and teaching-partner think it is appropriate.

Research sub-question #5: How does the degree of respect established impact the teachers' choice of "problems" on which to focus during the collaboration process? The data that have been collected and analyzed to date are limited in scope in that teachers did not directly address this issue. However, inferences can be drawn suggesting that respect appears to be related to: (a) the teacher's perception regarding the utility of direction or advice provided by the teaching-partner, and (b) whether or not the teacher perceives the comments made to be confined to areas of the teaching-partner's competence. It seems reasonable to argue that the more respect a teacher has for a teaching-partner, the more likely that teacher is to seek out that person's opinions regarding issues which are particularly sensitive or of importance.

General research question: After engaging in a program of teacher collaboration, what is the relationship between teacher trust and respect for his or her teaching-partner and the perceived outcomes which resulted from the collaboration activities? After reflecting on the responses to the five

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

research sub-questions, it appears that the relationship between teacher trust and respect for the teaching-partner and the perceived outcomes resulting from collaboration activities with that teaching-partner are inextricably intertwined. Essentially, without the existence of trust and respecf between two individuals, or at the very least without the potential to develop trust and respect, there does not appear to be any reason for two teachers to collaborate for the purpose of professional development.

The existence of one of these two elements without the other in a professional relationship between two teachers is also of questionable value if the purpose of the relationship is to enable the individuals to develop professionally. Teachers who trust their teaching-partners but do not respect them are not likely to take any discussions with their partners seriously. Similarly, teachers who respect their teaching-partners but do not trust them are not likely to permit access of their "true" concerns to their teaching-partners--again, this type of relationship is not likely to result in teacher professional development. This is not to say that teacher/teaching-partner relationships must start off with high degrees of mutual trust and respect. As long as the potential exists for developing further the characteristic which is lacking will ultimately allow the individuals to engage in very productive professional relationships.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The following section will be divided into two main parts. The first section addresses conclusions reached in this preliminary analysis of the data. The second section addresses recommendations emerging from the conclusions drawn. All conclusions reached and recommendations made herein are to be held very tentatively for at least two reasons. First, this report represents an analysis and discussion of only the preliminary data gathered for an ongoing study of the roles of trust and respect in teachers' professional relationships. And second, this study has limited generalizability, its purpose was to explore and garner an understanding of the possible answers regarding what parts trust and respect play in teacher professional relationships whose purpose are professional development. Consequently, a call is made not only to replicate this study with different groups of teachers from different contexts

but also to address the research questions using different research methods from that used in the present study.

Conclusions

Sgan and Milford's (1986) assertion that "school based teacher support teams offer a way of effectively providing direct instructional supervisory support to teacher" (p. 72) did apply to the participants from the three schools reported herein. Having considered the findings discussed above, eight conclusions present themselves.

1. Trust can be developed between teachers and administrators such that collaborative relationships become beneficial for all individuals. However, it is easier, and apparently quicker, to establish trust when the teacher/administrator relationship is not imposed or initiated by the administrator.
2. Respect is a perception held by the beholder for another person that is based on judgments about the value of the other person's insights. Contrary to the suggestions made in some of the literature on the topic, it is not necessary for teachers to have expertise in each others' subject areas for respect to develop.
3. In situations where collaborative relationships that are mandated by school or district policy, the length of time for trust and respect to develop appears to be longer than in situations where teachers voluntarily engage in collaboration with a partner of their choice.
4. The most energetic and broadly focused collaborative relationships appear to be those in which the members of the dyad share similar philosophical beliefs regarding the purpose of collaborating. This includes: (a) sharing a common understanding of the importance of having an interaction that is perceived as non-threatening evaluatively; (b) having mutual input to the process and being able to move in new directions as the need arises; and (c) seeing the pupils as the focus of the collaboration, not just during the process of collaborating but as a focus central to education.

5. Teachers desiring to use collaboration as a means for professional development may be best served by collaboration programs that allow them to decide whether or not to participate and, if they chose to participate, how to participate.
6. Teachers who have a low sense of teacher efficacy, in particular, may be best served by teacher collaboration programs in which they are not paired with administrators.
7. The interviews conducted to date in this study have only indirectly addressed the role of teacher respect for the teaching-partner. In particular, direct responses to questions regarding what teachers see as pertinent in establishing and developing respect are lacking from the present data and subsequent analysis.

Recommendations

Three recommendations for individuals interested in applying the present findings to practice and research emerge from the above conclusions. The first two recommendations address practical issues of implementing teacher collaboration for the purpose of professional development.

1. The arrangement of teachers into teacher collaboration teams should occur between individuals having similar philosophical beliefs as professional educators. Teachers should discuss their beliefs about teaching as well as their expectations regarding the collaboration process. Individuals who do not see "eye-to-eye" on these issues should consider working with other partners with whom they do see "eye-to-eye" on these issues.
2. Teachers should not be arbitrarily assigned administratively to work in teams if the central purpose of the teams is to promote professional development. Teams of this nature should be encouraged to develop by school administration through the provision of advocating professional development using a collaboration strategy and providing resources sufficient for teachers to overcome the often cited difficulties of lack of time and scheduling conflicts.

The final recommendation is directed at the research from which the preliminary analysis discussed in this paper has been drawn.

3. Future interviews need to address specifically what it is that teachers see as pertinent to establishing and developing "respect" for one another. Taking the limited information already gathered which is pertinent to this topic, the researchers need to pursue teachers' conceptualizations of what respect is and how it is fostered.

References

Acheson, K.A. & Gall, M.D. (1992). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Preservice and inservice applications (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Alvarez, D.S. (1992). *Professional growth seminars encourage shared decision making.* collaboration. NASSP Bulletin, 76(540).

Ashton, P.J., & Webb, R.B. (1986). Making a difference. New York: Longman.

Blumberg, A., and R.S. Jonas (1987). Permitting access: the teacher's control over supervision. Educational Leadership, 44(4), 59-62.

Brown, D.F. (April, 1994). Experiencing shared leadership: Teachers' reflections. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ED 370 927)

Cogan, M.L. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

da Costa, J.L. (1993). Teacher collaboration: A study of the teaching-learning relationship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1986). A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession. The Elementary School Journal, 86(4), 531-551.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H., & Krajewski, R.J. (1980). Special methods for the supervision of teachers, 2nd ed., New York: Holt.

Gresso, D.W. & Robertson, M.B. (1992). The principal as process consultant: Catalyst for change. NASSP Bulletin, 76(540).

Grimmett, P.P., & Crehan, E.P. (1990). Barry: A case-study of teacher reflection in clinical supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, Spring 1990.

Grimmett, P.P. and G.L. Erickson (1988). Reflection in teacher education. University of British Columbia: Pacific Educational Press.

Lesnik, M. (1987). Peer supervision and its positive administrative effects. The Canadian School Executive, 7(1): 8-9.

Little, J. (1987). Teachers as colleagues, in V.R. Koehler (ed.), Educators' handbook: A research perspective (pp. 491-518). New York: Longman.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.Little, J. W. (1987)

Lovell, J.T., & Wiles, K. (1983). Supervision for better schools (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Lyman, Morehead, & Foyle (1988, March). Building trust in supervision and evaluation. A workshop for instructional supervisors. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, March 12-15, 1988. Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 297)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Newmann, F.M. (1994, Spring). School-wide professional community. Issues in Restructuring Schools, 6. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service number ED 370 214)

Oberg, A.A. (1989). Supervision as a creative act. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5(1), 60-69.

Russell, T., & Spafford, C. (1986, April). Teachers as reflective practitioners in peer clinical supervision. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Sgan, A.D. & Clark, J.M. (May, 1986). Support teams for teachers: The principal's role, and how the team functions. NASSP Bulletin, 70(490)

Appendix

Interview Schedule 1

1. How did you come to know one another?
2. How long have you known one another?
3. What influenced you to work with your partner?
4. Have you worked together before? If so, what was the nature of that work?
5. What do you presently understand the teacher collaboration process to be?
6. Have you decided what it is that you are going to get out of this process? If you haven't decided, what sorts of things do you hope to get out of the process?
7. What do you believe is most important about teaching? In other words, what do you perceive good teaching is?

Interview Schedule 2

1. What was the focus of your observation?

2. How was it decided that this was what you were going to look for?

3. What was the focus of your post-observation conference?

4a. Did you and your partner stray from the focus that you had decided originally?

4b. If so, how?

4c. Did it bother you in any way?

5. As a result of observing your partner teach and then speaking to one another, what did you learn about your class that you didn't know before?

6. As a result of the classroom observation and the conference afterwards is there anything that you will repeat in the future because it wen so well?

7. Is there anything that you will change in the future because it didn't seem to work very well?

8. What do your student thing about having you partner in you class?

9. Which respect to your teaching, what do you find most useful about being able to talk to your partner?

10. I'd like you to think about the conference that you and your partner audio-taped for me.

10a. What sorts of words would you use to describe how you were feeling when you first started the discussion?

10b. What sorts of words would you use to describe how you were feeling in the middle of the discussion?

10c. What sorts of words would you use to describe how you were feeling as the conference drew to a close?

10d. What do you especially like about conferencing?

10e. What don't you particularly care for in this conferencing process?